DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 283 UD 018 323

AUTHOR Thomas, Charles B.
TITLE Community Leadership During School Desegregation Controversies: The Role of the Clergy in Boston.
PUB DATE 30 Mar 78
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 30, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Catholics; *Church Role; Citizen Participation; *Clergymen; Interviews; *Leadership Responsibility; Priests; Protestants; *Reactive Behavior; *Role Theory; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts (Boston)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted of clergy involvement in the Boston school desegregation controversy of the mid-1970's. Data were collected from interviews with a random sample of 75 black and white Protestant and Catholic ministers in Metropolitan Boston. The research, as described in this paper, tests and lends support to the validity of a role reference system model for predicting patterns of clergy participation in desegregation controversies and other community issues. The model posits that if the self reference system conflicts with the membership reference system, then the nature of the professional reference system can be of critical significance as a determiner of what the minister decides to do. The study extends the body of research on the prophetic role of religion and provides another demonstration of the importance of reference groups in influencing behavior. The findings support the notion that the nature of the professional reference system can determine whether a minister acts to support school desegregation during community controversy. This paper also contains suggestions for increasing clergy participation in community issues and a discussion of reference group theory, role theory, and a proposed link between them. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155283

Community Leadership During School Desegregation Controversies: The Role of the Clergy in Boston[1,2]

Charles B. Thomas
The Johns Hopkins University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles B. Thomas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

[1]This study was supported by an allocation from the Department of Psychology and Social Relations at Harvard University.

[2]I would like to express special appreciation to Professor Thomas F. Pettigrew, Professor Marie Augusta Neal, Dr. James M. Jones, and Professor Preston N. Williams for their invaluable advice during this research. Others too numerous to mention deserve acknowledgement and have my deepest gratitude, especially the ministers who cooperated in the study.

UD018323

Abstract

The research reported in this paper is a study of clergy involvement in the Boston school desegregation community controversy. A random sample of seventy-five black and white Protestant and Catholic ministers in Boston and in Boston suburbs were given interviews (of approximately one hour each) between August and December of 1975.

The research tests and lends support to the validity of a role reference system model, developed by Ernest Q. Campbell and Thomas F. Pettigrew in 1959, for predicting patterns of clergy participation in desegregation controversies and other community issues. The model posits that if the self-reference system (e.g., pro-desegregation attitudes of a minister) conflicts with the membership reference system (e.g., expectations of the minister's congregation members that the minister not support desegregation), then the nature of the professional reference system (e.g., support from bishops; stands taken by the denomination nationally; etc.) can be of critical significance as a determiner of what the minister decides to do. The research reported here extends the body of research on the prophetic role of religion and provides another demonstration of the importance of reference groups in influencing behavior. It and past research which has utilized the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model may have important theoretical implications in that it represents a linkage between reference group theory and role theory.

The paper contains suggestions for those interested in encouraging more clergy participation in community issues. The paper also discusses reference group theory, role theory, and a proposed link between them (as exemplified by the Campbell and Pettigrew model).

This report examines variables which help to explain and predict patterns of clergy involvement in the Boston school desegregation controversy during the mid-1970's. In order to test a theoretical model developed by Ernest Q. Campbell and Thomas F. Pettigrew in 1959, a stratified random sample of 75 black and white Protestant and Catholic ministers were interviewed between July and December of 1975. Although the present research specifically focussed on ministerial leadership in the Boston school desegregation controversy, the model tested is a more general one which is useful in predicting clergy leadership in various kinds of community controversies. It was expected that increasing social science knowledge of factors which influenced clergy decisions to work for social justice during periods of community controversy would enable those who were interested in encouraging clergy participation in social issues to do so more effectively.

The present research belongs to a tradition of research on what has been called the "prophetic function" of religion (see Yinger, 1957). This term denotes the function religion sometimes plays in challenging the status quo in society by, e.g., calling society to task for not living up to cherished values. (For example, the existence of racism in America violates values of American democracy--"All men are created equal"--as well as religious ideals of love and brotherhood or sisterhood.) Studies in the American context which have examined religion in its prophetic role include: (1) the investigation by Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) of stands taken by ministers during the school desegregation controversy in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957-1958; (2) the successful replication of the findings of the Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) study which was performed by Martin

(1969). Martin examined clergy support for an organization in Rochester, New York, which was the subject of community controversy during the years 1964-1967 as it attempted to secure meaningful jobs for minorities from Eastman Kodak; (3) Neal's (1965) investigation of responses to social change made by Boston Catholic priests; (4) the study of Protestant ministers in California in the 1960's by Quinley (1974) as these ministers confronted such social issues as the Viet Nam war and the farm labor movement; (5) Glock, Ringer, and Babbie's (1967) study of reactions of Episcopal clergy and laity to ministerial social action.

The present research, and the Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) model (which will be described below) upon which it is based, point to the importance of reference groups in influencing behavior. The reference group concept has a long history of use in social psychology; and the concept "...refers to the group used by the person as a standard against which to evaluate or to understand his or her own behavior or cognitions." (Schneider, 1976, p. 247). For example, for a given individual the family, a fraternity or sorority, a peer group, etc. might be reference groups. One of the most important contributions of reference group theory and research has been to point out that an individual's reference groups are not necessarily limited to his or her membership groups--i.e., to the groups to which the individual belongs. (See, e.g., Vander Zanden, 1977; Hyman & Singer, 1968; Merton & Rossi, 1968.) For example, one study (cited in Schneider, 1976, p. 248) showed that the reference group influence of a conservative female dorm led to increased conservatism both on the part of females who desired to move into the dorm and were able to do so (thus making the dorm a membership group) and on the part of females

who were not able to fulfill their desire to move into the dorm (thus the dorm did not become a membership group). Studies pointing to the importance of reference groups have indicated that making a reference group salient affects opinions and voting behavior; that females from conservative backgrounds have become liberal in college due to the liberal college reference group; that more sexist attitudes are expressed by males in all-male groups than in mixed-sex groups; that Catholics tend to give opinions more consistent with official Catholic doctrine when the Catholicism reference group is made salient than when it is not (Schneider, 1976, p. 247-249).

The present study is based directly on the Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) study of clergy involvement in the school desegregation crisis in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957 and 1958. In their analysis of the Little Rock controversy, Campbell and Pettigrew developed some specific hypotheses to help predict clergy behavior in future situations of community conflict such as that involving school desegregation. According to a role reference system model developed by Campbell and Pettigrew, if the self reference system (e.g., pro-desegregation attitudes of a minister) conflicts with the membership reference system (e.g., expectations of the minister's congregation members that the minister <u>not</u> support desegregation), then the nature of the professional reference system (e.g., support from bishops; stands taken by the denomination nationally; etc.) can be of critical significance as a determiner of what the minister decides to do. More generally, the model analyzes the ministerial role and the various expectations held for the minister's behavior by significant role reference systems. The minister's own expectations for his behavior (the self-reference system)

can be viewed in abstract terms as that which he would do in the absence of any external sanctions--because, e.g., the course of action in question is consistent with the self-image he carries of himself and would result in feelings of gratification for "doing the right thing;" or, to express it another way, the course of action in question would avoid guilt. (The male pronoun is used in this discussion because all the ministers in the Campbell and Pettigrew study and in the present study were males.) The membership reference system refers to the expectations held by the congregation members concerning the minister's behavior. Campbell and Pettigrew (1959, p. 87) conceive of the professional reference system as follows:

> The professional reference system consists of several sources mutually related to his occupational role as minister yet independent of his congregation. It includes national and regional church bodies, the local ecclesiastical hierarchy (if any), the local ministerial association, personal contacts and friendships with fellow ministers, and an image of "my church" in an abstract sense.

In general, Campbell and Pettigrew found that in the Little Rock situation, the self-reference system of ministers in the mainline Protestant denominations was pro-desegregation, the membership reference system was strongly anti-desegregation, and that the professional reference system did not provide effective support for pro-desegregation activities of clergymen. Consequently, the clergy did not play a sustained role in support of school desegregation during the crisis.

The validity of the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model was supported by data from their Little Rock study; and by a successful replication of their study in Rochester, New York done by Martin (1969). The present study is thus the second attempt to replicate the Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) study. The hypothesis for the current study may be

stated: "Given a minister with a self-reference system in favor of busing for integration, and with a membership reference system opposed to this, the nature of the minister's professional reference system will determine whether the minister acts in support of the school desegregation process." Thus, a positive correlation is expected between the pro-desegregation strength of the professional reference system and the behavioral support of school desegregation in Boston given by the minister for those ministers with pro-desegregation self-reference systems and with membership reference systems opposed to clergy support of school desegregation.

Method

Between July and December of 1975, a total of 75 black and white Protestant and Catholic clergymen (all persons in the population sampled were male) were interviewed in Boston and in the first ring of suburbs surrounding Boston. The sampling plan is presented in Table 1. Stratified random sampling was employed to obtain as representative a sample of Boston area clergy as possible. However, instead of random sampling, an attempt was made to interview the entire population of South Boston Catholics (N=14) and Black Protestant ministers in Boston (N=24). Except in South Boston, where both pastors and assistant ministers were interviewed, the targeted population was confined to pastors. Fifty-three interviews were conducted by a black interviewer and twenty-two by a white interviewer. The study was confined to Catholics and the three largest mainline Protestant denominations in Massachusetts (Episcopalian, United Church of Christ, and Baptist). Pastors of storefront churches, holiness, and evangelical groups were excluded from the sample.

Prior to the analysis of the data, 20 ministers (one white Protestant, nine black Protestants, five Catholics outside South Boston, and five South Boston Catholics) were deleted from the sample due to inadequate data on one or more of the items measuring the dependent variable. Thus, the strictly random and representative nature of the final sample may be questioned and appropriate caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of the study.

The dependent variable was the behavior or action of ministers with respect to the Boston school desegregation controversy. Seven items in the interview schedule (e.g., asking how often a minister had preached sermons, ridden school busses, etc., to support desegregation) measured the dependent variable. A sample dependent variable item from the interview schedule is: "Participating in pro-bussing or pro-desegregation marches, rallies, or demonstrations sponsored or endorsed by the NAACP or other such pro-desegregation groups." (The minister is asked to indicate on a 9-item scale how often, if at all, he did this.)

A sample of one of the six items measuring the self-reference system is: "I believe Christian values call for Christians to favor integration." (The minister is asked to indicate his response to this statement on a six item agree-disagree scale.)

The following is a sample of one of the nine items measuring the professional reference system: "How do most of your close friends who are clergymen feel about the school desegregation process which is currently going on in Boston?" (The minister indicates his response on a seven-point scale ranging from strongly oppose to strongly support the school desegregation process in Boston.)

Five items measured the membership reference system, including the following item: "About what percent of your congregation members feel the following ways about school desegregation in Boston? The categories are: (a) oppose school desegregation, (b) neutral, no opinion, (c) favor school desegregation." The items from the interview schedule used to measure the dependent variable and the self-reference system, professional reference system, and membership reference system independent variables were transformed to scales such that the maximum positive value on each scale represented the maximum force in a pro-desegregation direction.

Results and Discussion

A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was computed between professional reference system scores and dependent variable scores for the 21 ministers with negative membership reference system scores (regarding support of school desegregation) and positive self-reference system scores. As predicted, a significant positive correlation was obtained: $r = .436$, $p \leq .025$, one-tailed test.

Thus, the findings support the notion that the nature of the professional reference system can be of critical importance in determining whether a minister acts to support school desegregation during community controversy. In three studies (Campbell and Pettigrew, 1959; Martin, 1969; and the present study, 1976) which span nearly two decades and which were conducted in three different cities (Little Rock, Rochester, & Boston) in different regions of the country, the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model has proven useful in explaining and predicting patterns of clergy involvement in community controversies. We can thus have a significant amount of confidence in the model.

It is a common finding that the congregation members of liberal clergy are more conservative than their ministers (see, e.g., Quinley, 1974; Campbell & Pettigrew, 1959). That is, the self-reference systems of the liberal clergy are more liberal than are their membership reference systems. In cases such as this, when the liberal minister will expect to face a great deal of opposition from his congregation if he chooses to take a liberal stand during a community controversy, the various elements of the professional reference system can be of very great or crucial importance in providing support for ministers who would like to follow the dictates of their self-reference systems and work for social justice.

Thus, the findings of the current study have implications for those who are interested in encouraging more active participation of clergy in support of efforts to bring about social justice in situations of community controversy, such as when a community is undergoing school desegregation. Such advocates would do well to attempt to strengthen professional reference system support for the controversial community issue. For example, it is important to encourage bishops and prominent religious superiors to use their power as a moral force, both publicly and privately. Ministers should be encouraged to be supportive of other clergy who might desire to follow the dictates of their self-reference systems and act to support such controversial issues as school desegregation. The importance of taking stands at national conventions of religious bodies which call for social justice is underscored by this research.

More can be said about strengthening professional reference system support for increased clergy participation in social issues. These

comments are made with the hope that some may be found to be useful suggestions; however, it is recognized that some may be impractical and some may already have occurred to the minds of others. There are a great number of demands on a minister's time (see Glock & Stark, 1965, p. 144, 145, 150). He or she must be administrator, preacher, teacher, dispenser of the sacraments, etc. Time demanded by involvement in social issues surely places a significant additional strain on the minister. To help alleviate this strain, and to further give an institutional stamp of legitimacy to the notion of clergy participation in social issues, a flexible program of short-term "leaves for social action" might be recommended for adoption by various church bodies. As Campbell and Pettigrew (1959, p. 92) note, the role of the minister as social reformer is not institutionalized with a system of specific evaluative criteria to which the minister can compare his performance, as is the role, e.g., of the minister as an administrator. This, of course, is likely to remain the case for the most part. However, the role of minister as social reformer might at least be given some increased institutional support and clarification--for example, by offering well publicized medals or awards for contributions to social action each year. In addition, more ministers might be enabled and encouraged to participate more effectively in working for social change by an increased emphasis on specific training in techniques of social action during seminary training and afterwards.

Some Additional Theoretical Considerations

Introduction

In this part of the paper I will discuss some important theoretical issues related to the research which has been reported here. A major point to be made is that the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model exemplifies a linkage between role theory and reference group theory. Developing such a link between the two theories might be beneficial to both of them; and might result in increased explanatory power and rich new hypotheses.

At this point I should clarify the aims of the discussion which will follow, and particularly note its relatively circumscribed goals. I am certainly not the first to propose a linkage between reference group theory and role theory, nor the first to suggest that making such linkages might be beneficial (see, e.g., Schmitt, 1972, p. 156, 157, 183). In this sense what I have to say is not original (although I believe the specific link I set forth may be an original one). The treatment below also is lacking in a certain breadth--in the sense that I am suggesting one link when others no doubt are also possible. The reference group and the role group concepts have been criticized for having certain theoretical weaknesses, as indicated in the discussion below. Although I suggest linking these two concepts, I do not offer any suggestions on how each concept might be improved in its own right. One can no doubt find additional faults with the discussion below. Despite these lacks, however, I am hoping that the discussion which follows will be of value for its treatment of the issues it does address - even though it is readily acknowledged that there are many related issues which are not treated.

Below, I will first discuss the present status of reference group theory. Then I will present some major concepts from role theory. Next

I will point out that a link between the two theories consists of the fact that the "counter positions of a role set" are in fact reference groups. Finally, I will discuss the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model, and point out how it exemplifies this linkage between role theory and reference group theory.

Present status of reference group theory. Merton and Rossi (1968, p. 35) note, "That men act in a social frame of reference yielded by the groups of which they are a part is a notion undoubtedly ancient..." However, as Hyman and Singer (1968) point out, there are also numerous examples of behavior which would seem to contradict this notion that men and women take on the values, attitudes, and behaviors of their membership groups. Some examples might be: "...upper class individuals with radical ideologies and revolutionary allegiances, those who feel deprived despite relatively advantaged positions, the products of an orthodox milieu who end up nonconformist. Ordinary language is rich in terms that describe such individuals who do not show the stamp of their group: the renegade Catholic, shabby gentility, the Tory worker." (Hyman and Singer, 1968, p. 3). Reference group theory--in what is perhaps its most distinctive contribution (Hyman & Singer, 1968, p. 4; Williams, 1970, p. 550, 551)--explains such behavior which would not be predicted by a simple knowledge of membership groups. Reference group research and theory indicates that people can orient themselves to groups they don't belong to--and thus enlarges a theory of group determination of attitudes and behavior (Hyman & Singer, 1968, p. 4, p. 9). Since reference groups may be non-membership groups, the potential number of a person's reference groups is virtually unlimited (Merton and Rossi, 1968, p. 35).

Although reference group theory has made such an important contribution to social science understanding of human behavior, as a theory it is nevertheless beset with serious problems. In the first place, the precise meaning of the term is a matter of dispute among major reference group theorists (Williams, 1970). Some theorists feel the concept should be limited only to what has been called the normative function of reference groups (i.e., the role of reference groups in setting standards for the individual's behavior). Others insist on including both the normative function and comparative function (in which an individual uses a reference group as a basis of comparison for self-evaluation) as part of the legitimate meaning of the concept. It has also been noted that it is sometimes difficult or impossible to separate these two meanings of the concept. And finally, it has been proposed that the reference group concept involves more than two (e.g., four) functions. Such problems as these lead Williams (1970, p. 550) to conclude: "In sum, the reference group concept, despite its wide use in sociology, social psychology, and other fields, is still not conceptually clarified."

Part of the theory's problems may in fact be due to its wide use. Hyman first used the term in 1942 (Williams, 1970; Hyman & Singer, 1968). However, it did not receive wide attention until the 1950's, beginning with work based on data from the study The American Soldier by Stouffer and his associates. In the 1950's and 1960's, it became very widely used. Criticism that the theory provided circular explanations also were often heard. Williams (1970, p. 545) notes that "Its popularity indeed has so frequently led to its serving as an all-purpose post-hoc explanation of behavior that it has led to the wry definition, 'Your reference group

is a group that you behave like and you behave like them because they're your reference group' (Cohen, 1962)." Hyman and Singer (1968, p. 17) object to the term's use as a "magic term to explain anything and everything about group relations" and call such practices "reckless." As would be expected to happen to anything that gains tremendous faddish attention, the popularity of reference group theory has waned in the last several years. It may be instructive to note, for example, that one is unable to find a psychological journal article reviewing the literature on reference group theory and research after 1970.

Even before 1970, however, the problem of neglected areas of research relating to reference group theory existed. Hyman and Singer (1968, p. 8) note, e.g., that little attention has been given to reference individuals (as contrasted with reference groups); and that the comparative function of reference groups (as contrasted with the normative function) has received insufficient attention from researchers in the past several years. The magnitude of work which needs to be done and which was outlined by Merton is massive, as Williams (1970, p. 547) indicates: "It is also difficult not to feel some despair at the prospect of attacking any of the problems [Merton] raises in the discussion on reference groups and social structures. The categorizations, considerations, and theoretical problems extend over one hundred pages and include at one point twenty-six group properties that one might consider in classifying types of membership groups."

In conclusion, reference group theory has enjoyed wide use by social scientists, and has proven itself to be an important and useful tool to aid social scientific understanding. However, the concept also

possesses some serious inadequacies. (For a more detailed and an optimistic discussion of the theoretical status of reference group theory, see Schmitt, 1972.) This same description would apply to role theory (see, e.g., Hollander & Hunt, 1971; Homans, 1971).

The discussion will now turn to a presentation of some major concepts of role theory (following parts of the discussion by Hunt, 1971). The next topic treats of the link between role theory and reference group theory. I will then show that the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model exemplifies this linking of role and reference group theory.

Some major concepts of role theory. For the discussion of role theory, such concepts as the following are relevant: positions; complementarity of positional structures; roles; and role sets. "Positions," in a social system, are functional divisions of labor which are useful in achieving the system's goals. Positions are populated by a collection of particular individuals. Each individual occupies at least one position and very often more than one.

There is a complementarity of positional structure in social systems. If one looks at positions as part of dyadic units, the "rights" of a given "focal-position" are the "duties" of some other "counter-position." For example, the rights of the focal-position "child" are the duties of the counter-position "mother."

A "role," then, represents the content of a "position"--i.e., the behavioral implications of occupying a particular "position." Certain patterns of behavior are mutually expected by the occupants of positions regarding their rights and duties vis-a-vis one another. Thus, a role

is properly described with reference to other roles which are complementary to it. It might also be noted that roles involve expectations for attributes (personality characteristics) as well as behavior, and as such contribute to definitions of the self.

The next important concept is that of "role-set." A given focal-position or role will likely be organized relative to more than one counter-position. For example, the focal-position "teacher" is organized relative to the counter-positions "pupil," "colleague," "principal," etc. The total number of counter-positions for a given focal-position is the "role-set" of that focal-position. The same focal-position or role (e.g., "teacher") will vary depending on which counter-position (e.g., "pupil" vs. "principal") it stands in relation to at a given time.

Role expectations are of great importance, as Hunt (1971, p. 281, 28^) indicates: "...each person...forms constructions of what others expect of him...a person's conceptualization of others' expectations will be an important influence upon his behavior."

Linking role theory and reference group theory. Reference group theory and role theory are alike in that they are both major concepts in social psychology and sociology. Although both have had wide use among social scientists and have proven themselves to be of value, both are beset by major theoretical problems (see, e.g., Williams, 1970; Hyman & Singer, 1968; Homans, 1971, p. 50, 51; Hollander and Hunt, 1971, p. 248). These two concepts have grown up and have been used as independent traditions within the social sciences. Schmitt (1972, p. 156), for example, speaks of the "...few sources that have explicitly linked reference group theory to role theory..." Such a link might be a source

of rich new hypotheses and increased explanatory power (see, e.g., Schmitt, 1972). The link to be proposed would seem to relate to what has been called the normative (as contrasted with the comparative) function of reference groups.

Ben-David (1958) provides the basis for such a conceptual link. Ben-David (1958, p. 272) notes:

> "My concept of reference group is intrinsically related to the concept of role. I use it to denote the system--obviously "group" is a mistaken word in almost any current definition of the concept--which serves as a frame of reference for self-evaluation in any aspect of a role. Since role has been defined by expectations issuing from the various systems of society, these will be the potential reference "groups" of a role (under conditions that have to be further specified). This of course implies that I distinguish between the structural reference groups--which are limited in number--and the incidental ones, whose number are theoretically unlimited."

In my analysis, Ben-David's distinction between "incidental" and "structural" (Ben-David, 1958, p. 268) may be viewed as follows. "Structural" reference groups are those counter-positions that, by the accepted definition of the focal-position or role, stand in organizational relationship to it. That is, the "structural reference groups" are those counter-positions that comprise the role set of the focal-position (or role). Other reference groups would be incidental reference groups.

In short, it is reasonable to view "reference groups" as comprising the counter-positions of a role-set. For example, for the role of "physician," those counter-positions (structural reference groups) which stand in organizational relationship to it by the accepted definition of the role would include professional "colleagues" (other physicians) and "patients" (Ben-David, 1958, p. 268). Next I will discuss the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model in this framework.

The Campbell and Pettigrew model. The Campbell and Pettigrew model provides a good illustration of this link between role theory and reference group theory. In the Campbell and Pettigrew model which analyzes the role of "minister," the counter-positions in the role-set are the professional reference system (i.e., the expectations held by colleagues, bishops, etc.), the membership reference system (the expectations for the ministerial role held by congregation members), and the self-reference system (the expectations held for behavior in the role of minister by the minister himself). These three counter-positions in the role-set of "minister" are, in fact, "reference groups." That is, these counter-positions are "...used by the person as a standard against which to evaluate or to understand his or her own behavior or cognitions" (cf. definition of reference groups in Schneider, 1976, p. 247). It can thus be seen how the link between role theory and reference group theory which was identified above is implicit in the role reference system model of Campbell and Pettigrew.

Some further comments are relevant here. One of the elements of the Campbell and Pettigrew model is the self-reference system. It should be noted that, in cases where the minister (or other actor) cannot realistically ignore what others expect of him or her and the sanctions they might use, the conceptual difficulty of defining the self-reference system is recognized. That is, it is difficult to conceptually isolate the minister's expectations of himself or herself, since these are naturally assumed to be very much related to or dependent upon what others expect of him or her. Nevertheless, although somewhat difficult to isolate conceptually, Campbell and Pettigrew

argue persuasively that the self-reference system must be viewed as an important component in their role reference system model (See Campbell and Pettigrew, 1959, p. 87, footnote 5.)

I would also like to note that the Campbell and Pettigrew model is a general one not limited to the analysis of the ministerial role. It can be used in the analysis of role conflict in any case where the actor is responsible to some "public" (Campbell & Pettigrew, 1959, p. 87, footnote 4). For example, one might analyze role conflict in the case of the role "senator"--e.g., in a situation involving some controversial bill which the senator personally favors (self-reference system) and the great majority of his constituents (cf. membership reference system) opposes. In such a case, one might predict that the support or lack of support the senator receives for his or her views from other senators (cf. professional reference system) will be a crucial influence in determining what decision the senator makes.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, the present study has tested the Campbell and Pettigrew role reference system model's relevance to predicting clergy involvement in the Boston school desegregation controversy. For those ministers with positive self-reference systems and negative membership reference systems, the predicted positive correlation was obtained between strength of professional reference system support for Boston school desegregation and strength of behavioral support given by ministers to desegregation.

Finally, I would like to indicate some of the contributions I hope the current research can make, at least to some limited extent. It is hoped that it will make a "historical" contribution of a certain

kind since data has been collected on the behavior of clergy in Boston at a special historical moment. That is, the Boston school desegregation issue for a period received national and international attention and became an important issue to study in its own right. Information about the behavior of potentially important actors in the Boston situation during that period may be seen as having some historical significance. In addition, it is hoped that the present study contributes something of importance to the traditions of research on the Campbell and Pettigrew model, the prophetic role of religion, and reference groups. It and the past research using the Campbell and Pettigrew model may have important theoretical implications in that it exemplifies a link between role theory and reference group theory.

Table 1. The Sample*

I. White		
A. Catholic		
1. South Boston		9
2. Outside South Boston		
a. Boston		12
b. Suburbs		12
B. Protestant		
1. Boston		12
2. Suburbs		12
II. Black		
A. Protestant		
1. Boston		18
	TOTAL (N)	75

*Prior to the analysis of the data, twenty respondents were deleted from the sample due to inadequate data on one or more of the items measuring the dependent variable. Those respondents who were deleted included: five South Boston Catholics, five white Catholics outside South Boston, one white Protestant, and nine black Protestants.

References

Ben-David, J. The professional role of the physician in bureaucratized medicine: A study in role conflict. Human Relations, 1958, 11(3), 255-274.

Campbell, E. Q. and Pettigrew, T. F. Christians in racial crisis: A study of Little Rock's ministry. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959.

Glock, C. Y. and Stark, R. Religion and society in tension. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965.

Glock, C. Y., Ringer, B. B., and Babbie, E. R. To comfort and to challenge: A dilemma of the contemporary church. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Hollander, E. P. and Hunt, R. G. Current perspectives in social psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971, Introduction to Part V, pp. 245-253.

Homans, G. C. Discovery and explanation in social science. In E. P. Hollander and R. G. Hunt (Eds.), Current perspectives in social psychology (3rd edition). New York: Oxford University Press, 1971, pp. 49-57.

Hunt, R. G. Role and role conflict. In E. P. Hollander and R. G. Hunt (Eds.), Current perspectives in social psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971, pp. 279-285.

Hyman, Herbert H. and Singer, E. Readings in reference group theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1968, Introduction, pp. 3-21.

Martin, W. C. Christians in conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1969.

Merton, R. K. and Rossi, A. K. Contributions to the theory of reference group behavior. In H. H. Hyman and E. Singer, Readings in reference group theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1968, pp. 28-68.

Neal, M. A. Values and interests in social change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Quinley, H. E. The prophetic clergy: Social activism among Protestant ministers. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Schmitt, Raymond L. The reference other orientation: An extension of the reference group concept. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972, Chapters 7 and 9.

Schneider, David J. Social psychology. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1976.

Vander Zanden, James W. Social Psychology. New York: Random House, 1977.

Williams, M. A. Reference groups: A review and commentary. Sociological Quarterly, 1970, 11(4), 545-554.

Yinger, J. Milton. Religion, society, and the individual. New York: Macmillan, 1957.